## **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached "Replacement Sheet," which includes FIG. 1, replaces the original sheet including FIG. 1.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-68 are now pending in the application. Minor amendments have been made to the specification to simply overcome the objections to the specification and rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephonic interview conducted on Wednesday, October 5, 2005.

## **DRAWINGS**

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval. In the "Replacement Sheet," Applicants amended FIG. 1 to include a computer 17. Applicants amended the specification to include reference numeral 17 for the computer. Applicants respectfully note that the specification already referred to the computer, and therefore no new matter is added.

## REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 63 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Findlater et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,385,208). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner acknowledges the allowable subject matter of Claim 57. In particular, the Examiner acknowledges that the prior art of record does not teach a physical layer component "including two interface pins corresponding to each pair of the at least two Ethernet network ports" and "a media access control layer component

including two interface pins corresponding to each pair of the at least two Ethernet network ports." Applicants amend Claim 63 to recite "two interface pins corresponding to each pair of the at least two Ethernet network ports" and "two interface pins corresponding to each pair of the at least two Ethernet network ports."

Findlater does not show, teach, or suggest such a structure. For anticipation to be present under 35 U.S.C §102, there must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure as viewed by one skilled in the field of the invention. <u>Scripps Clinic & Res. Found. V. Genentech, Inc.</u>, 18 USPQ.2d 1001 (Fed. Cir. 1991). All of the limitations of the claim must be inherent or expressly disclosed and must be arranged as in the claim. <u>Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices, Inc.</u>, 7 USPQ.2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

The Examiner alleges that Findlater discloses "connectivity means including two interface pins per pair of ports" and communication means "including two interface pins per pair of ports" at Column 6, Lines 60-67. However, Applicant respectfully submits that the relied upon portion of Findlater recites that the number of pins required is "two times the number of ports plus two." In other words, Findlater discloses that at least two pins per port is required. In contrast, Applicants' Claim 63 recites "two interface pins corresponding to each pair of the at least two Ethernet network ports," or one pin per port. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 63, as well as its corresponding dependent claims, should be allowable.

Serial No. 10/010,732

**ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER** 

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for favorable consideration of Claims

1-62 and 64-68, which were allowed or indicated as allowable.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly

traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests

that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is

believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office

Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt

and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this

application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 4, 2005

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303

MDW/dms

P.O. Box 828

(248) 641-1600